Original: This is a form from a State-Bar program with the words that contribute to its meaning underlined.

MOTION TO DISMISS OF GARNER WELL CONTROL, INC.

THE HONORABLE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT:

Now comes <u>Garner Well Control, Inc.</u>, hereinafter referred to as <u>"Garner"</u>, <u>Third-Party Defendant</u> in the above-styled and numbered action, and files this its Motion <u>[moves] to Dismiss [under]</u> pursuant to <u>Rule 12(b)(6)</u> of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and in support thereof would respectfully show unto the Court as follows:

I.

The action was initially filed by <u>Garret A. Hobart [sued]</u> against <u>defendants Clinton Service Company</u>, <u>Clinton Producing Company</u>, <u>Clinton Pipeline Co.</u>, and <u>Barkley Offshore Company</u>, as the owners and operators of a special purpose <u>drilling platform Clinton No. 6</u>, located <u>on the Outer Continental Shelf</u> of the United States <u>adjacent to</u> the State of <u>Texas</u>. <u>The lawsuit</u> was filed on October 2l, 1985 <u>claim[ed]</u> that the plaintiff was an employee of <u>Garner Control Services</u>, <u>Inc.</u> At no time has <u>the plaintiff [has never asserted]</u> filed any <u>claim</u> or cause of action against "<u>Garner</u>" in this action.

On April 2, l986 "Garner" filed its answer to the third-party complaint of <u>Clinton Service Company</u>, defendant and third-party plaintiff, based upon the original <u>[filed a third-party complaint]</u> in which there was an attempt to state a cause of action based upon an alleged agreement <u>of indemnification.</u>

More recently, however, the defendant and third-party plaintiff <u>Clinton</u> Service Company <u>has [added]</u> attempted to state a <u>claim</u> based upon <u>[of] negligence against the plaintiff's employer "Garner".</u> As will be addressed more particularly hereinbelow, Clinton Service Company <u>has no claim</u> or cause of action against <u>[Garner as] the plaintiff's employer</u> "Garner" <u>on</u> an independent theory of <u>negligence.</u>

II.

The Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, 43 U.S.C.A., Sec. 1331, et seq., makes the laws of the United States applicable to all artificial islands and fixed structures erected on the Outer Continental Shelf for the purpose of exploring for, developing removing and transporting resources therefrom. Section 905 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, 33 U.S.C.A., Sec. 901, et seq., provides that the liability of an employer prescribed in Section 904 of the Act, shall be exclusive and in place of all other liability of such employer to the employee, his parents, next of kin, and anyone otherwise entitled to recover damages from such employer on account of injury or death. This action is therefore barred by the exclusivity provisions of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act and should be dismissed as to Garner Well Control, Inc.

In response to third-party defendant Garner's Request for Admissions, third-party plaintiff [Clinton] has admitted to the following facts (the numbers correspond to the Admissions):

- l. That <u>the</u> alleged <u>accident</u> in question <u>involving</u> Garret A. <u>Hobart occurred on a fixed platform.</u>
- 2. That the location of <u>the fixed platform</u> in question <u>was</u> at the time of the alleged occurrence involving Garret A. Hobart <u>on the Outer</u> Continental Shelf.
- 3. That the fixed platform on which Garret A. Hobart had his alleged accident is [was] more than three miles from the shore.

A true, correct and accurate copy of the Answers to Garner's Requests for <u>Admissions are attached</u> hereto, marked as Exhibit "A" and incorporated herein by reference.

IV.

In light of the above, third-party defendant <u>Garner states that there are no disputed fact[s]</u> issues with regard to <u>whether it is an employer under</u> Sections 904 and 905 of <u>the Longshoremen's & Harbor Workers' Compensation Act</u>, which sections were made <u>applicable</u> to this cause <u>by</u> way of <u>the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act</u>, 43 U.S.C.A., Sec. 1331, et seq. Accordingly, the liability of an employer prescribed in Section 904 of the Longshoremen's & Harbor Workers' Compensation Act is exclusive and in place of all other liability of such employer to the employee and anyone who might otherwise be entitled to recover damages from such employer on account of injury or death. This action is therefore barred by the exclusivity provisions of the Longshoremen's & Harbor Workers' Compensation Act and should be dismissed as to Garner Well Control, Inc.

V.

In the alternative, if and in the unlikely event that this Court determines that the Longshoremen's & Harbor Workers' Compensation Act does not apply to the facts of this case then, and in that event, this defendant says that at all times material hereto

it <u>[Garner]</u> had in force and effect a policy of Worker's Compensation Insurance and thus the third-party <u>[Clinton's]</u> claim is still barred under the applicable provisions of the Texas Workers'

<u>Compensation Act.</u> <u>A</u> true, correct and accurate <u>copy of</u> such <u>policy is attached</u> hereto, marked as Exhibit "B" and incorporated herein by reference for all purposes.

WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED, third-party defendant, <u>Garner Well Control</u>, <u>Inc.</u>, <u>respectfully requests this</u> Honorable <u>Court to</u> grant its Motion to Dismiss, and <u>dismiss this</u> cause of <u>action</u> against it <u>with prejudice</u>.

Respectfully Submitted,

Edited Version: This is the underlined parts with the fluff. deleted.

MOTION TO DISMISS OF GARNER WELL CONTROL

Garner Well Control, Inc. (Garner), third-party defendant, [moves] to dismiss [under] Rule 12(b)(6).

Garret A. Hobart [sued] Clinton Service Company, Clinton Producing Company, Clinton Pipeline Co., and Barkley Offshore Company, as the owners and operators of a special purpose drilling platform, Clinton No. 6, on the outer continental shelf adjacent to Texas. The lawsuit claim[ed] that the plaintiff was an employee of Garner. The plaintiff [has never asserted a] claim against Garner.

Clinton Service Company [filed] a third-party complaint of indemnification. Clinton [added] a claim [of] negligence against the plaintiff's employer, Garner. Clinton has no claim against [Garner].

The Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, 43 U.S.C. § 1331, makes the laws of the United States applicable to all fixed structures on the outer continental shelf for developing resources. The Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, 33 U.S.C. § 901, provides that the liability of an employer [under] the Act shall be exclusive and in place of all other liability of [the] employer to the employee and anyone otherwise entitled to recover damages from [the] employer. This action, therefore, is barred by the exclusivity provisions of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

[Clinton] has admitted:

- 1. the accident involving Hobart occurred on a fixed platform.
- 2. the fixed platform was on the outer continental shelf.
- 3. the fixed platform [was] more than three miles from the shore.

The Admissions are attached.

There are no disputed fact[s] whether [Garner] is an employer under the Longshoremen's & Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, applicable by the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act.

[Garner] had in force a policy of Worker's Compensation Insurance and thus [Clinton's] claim is still barred under the Texas Workers' Compensation Act. A copy of [the] policy is attached.

Garner Well Control, Inc., respectfully requests this Court to dismiss this action with prejudice.

Respectfully submitted,

Suggested Version: This is how it should be written.

GARNER'S MOTION TO DISMISS CLINTON'S THIRD-PARTY ACTION

1. Dismissal. Garner moves to dismiss Clinton Service Company's third-party action for indemnity and negligence because, as Hobart's employer, Garner is protected by the Exclusivity Clauses of the Longshoremen & Harbor Workers' Compensation Act as applied by the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act and of the Texas Workers' Compensation Act.

2. Facts.

- A. Garner employed Hobart at the time of the accident on a fixed platform.
- B. The platform was on the US-Texas continental shelf and engaged in resource development.
- C. Clinton was the operator of the platform.
- D. Hobart sued Clinton, and Clinton sued Garner.
- 3. LHWCA. The Longshoremen & Harbor Workers' Compensation Act is a federal plan for injured workers that parallels the ordinary state workers' compensation statutes. It includes a provision that: "The liability of an employer [under the act] shall be exclusive and in place of all other liability of such employer to the employee . . . and anyone otherwise entitled to recover damages from such employer " 33 U.S.C. § 905.
- 4. OCSLA. The Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act applies the LHWCA to structures like the platform on which Hobart worked. 43 U.S.C. § 1331.
- 5. Texas Act. Garner carried a policy of workers' compensation insurance covering Hobart; therefore, Clinton's action is barred by the similar exclusivity provision of the Texas statute. Tex. Rev. Civ. Stat. art. 8306 (1967).
- 6. Conclusion. Clinton's third-party action is barred by federal and state statutory law, and its action should be dismissed with prejudice.

Submitted respectfully,

Attachments:

- A. Admissions
- B. Insurance Policy